## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Anthony McDonald,

Plaintiff,

-against-

City of New York et al.,

Defendants.

USDC SDNY DOCUMENT	
ELECTRONICALLY FILED	
DOC #:	121
DATE FILED:	1/5/2021
	1/5/2021

1:20-cv-03889 (LTS) (SDA)

**ORDER** 

## STEWART D. AARON, United States Magistrate Judge:

Following a telephone conference with the parties, during which only Defendants appeared, it is hereby Ordered as follows:

- The deadline for Defendant NYCHA to respond to the Complaint is extended until January 22, 2021.
- The parties are directed to appear for a telephone conference on Friday, March 5,
  2021 at 10:00 a.m. At the scheduled time, the parties shall each separately call (888)
  278-0296 (or (214) 765-0479) and enter access code 6489745.

Plaintiff failed to appear for today's conference despite apparent receipt of the Court's Orders via mail. During today's conference, counsel for Defendant City of New York also set forth the efforts she has made to contact Plaintiff, including by calling him at the telephone number listed on the docket and by emailing him at the email address set forth in his Declaration (ECF

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> There is no indication on the docket that any mail sent by the Court has been returned. In any event, if Plaintiff's address has changed it is his duty to inform the Court and Defendants of any changes of address. See Reyes v. NY F&B Servs. LLC, No. 15-CV-02882 (LTS) (DCF), 2016 WL 3826283, at \*1 n.1 (S.D.N.Y. July 12, 2016) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted); see also Terry v. City of New York, No. 20-CV-00081 (ER), 2020 WL 5913409, at \*2 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 6, 2020) ("Whether Plaintiff actually received the Court's orders is inconsequential, as it remained his duty to diligently pursue his case and to inform this Court's Pro Se Office of any change of address.") (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

Case 1:20-cv-03889-LTS-SDA Document 41 Filed 01/05/21 Page 2 of 2

No. 6), and represented that she has received no response. Plaintiff is reminded that it is his

responsibility to comply with Court Orders and "diligently prosecute his case." Murray v. Bouck,

No. 19-CV-00317 (MKV), 2020 WL 6381935, at \*3 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 30, 2020) (citing cases). Failure

to do so is grounds for dismissal under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). See, e.g., Ellis v.

Catalano, No. 16-CV-08452 (KMK), 2020 WL 4432521, at \*2 (S.D.N.Y. July 31, 2020) (citing cases).

Accordingly, if Plaintiff fails to appear for the March 5, 2021 conference, I will

recommend to District Judge Swain that this action be dismissed without prejudice for failure

to prosecute. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

The Clerk of Court is directed to mail copy of this Order to the pro se Plaintiff.

SO ORDERED.

DATED:

New York, New York

January 5, 2021

STEWART D. AARON

United States Magistrate Judge

Sterrt d. aum

2